05-1644 (3)
IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
OCT 27 2006

Sgt. Emmett L. Williams
Petitioner, Plaintiff
-Vs.-

State of Georgia, "et al" 05-15760-C (05-1644), and three other Incorporated or Amended Conspiracy Cases' Cases Numbers: 05-15648-J (06-125), 05-17046-B (06-507), and 05-11275-A (05-833)
Respondents, Defendants

(28 U.S.C. &2403(a)) The Petitioner is Requesting a Full Panel REHEARING of all (9) nine JUSTICES where the Petitioner will present this question to all of the JUSTICES on the Panel "as to whether do they believe that the Petitioner should be Discriminated against solely on the bases of the color of his skin" because on September 27, 2002, the Respondents were served the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit Complaint by the Attorney Charles D. Best where on September 27, 2002, the Respondents and the Attorney Charles D. Best formed an illegal, unlawful, unconstitutional, and discriminatory Undisclosed Dual Agency Relationship where on September 27, 2002, the Respondents and the Attorney Charles D. Best purchased and sold the United States Courthouse Serving Papers that were used as to DEAD DOCKETING the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit Case (1:02-CV-2197) where on September 27, 2002, the Respondents proceeded by terminating the Petitioner's Employment from the State of Georgia without a P.M.P. or any other Justifiable Probable Causes where in accordance with the Georgia State Law of Undisclosed Dual Agency and Federal Retaliation and Discrimination Laws of the E.E.O.C. and the United States Constitution under Titles I, V, and VII have RESERVED all of the Petitioner rights to RESCIND any and all transactions made under a Undisclosed Dual Agency Relationship including the February 12, 2003 Dismissal of the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit Case (1:02-CV-2197) that does not BEAR the Petitioner's Signature for Dismissal as being "the Only Party of Consent" as the Lawsuit's Creator and Originator that makes the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit (1:02-CV-2197) a valid and enforceable Lawsuit where "the doctrine of res judicata" CANNOT and does not apply or exist in any of the Petitioner's Federally Filed Lawsuit Amendments filed in this case.

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit and the United States District Court for Northern District of Georgia
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
Sgt. Emmett L. Williams, Pro-Se Litigant
1266 Redford Avenue, Columbus, Georgia 31903
IN THE NAME OF JUSTICE BECAUSE JUSTICE SO REQUIRES

Question Presented.

(28 U.S.C. &2403(a)). On August 08, 2002, it was the Petitioner that created and filed his own lawsuit in Federal Court before the Attorney Charles D. Best was hired on **September 09, 2002** where the Georgia State Law of Undisclosed Dual Agency and Federal Retaliation and Discrimination Laws of the E.E.O.C. and the United States Constitution under Titles I, V, and VII have RESERVED all the rights of the Petitioner to RESCIND any and all transactions made under a Undisclosed Dual Agency Relationship including the February 12, 2003 Dismissal of the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit (1:02-CV-2197) that does not BEAR the Petitioner's Signature for Dismissal as being "the Only Party of Consent" as the Lawsuit's Creator and Originator that makes the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit (1:02-CV-2197) a valid and enforceable lawsuit where "the doctrine of res judicata" CANNOT and does not apply of exist in any the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. Lawsuit Amendments (05-833, 05-1644, 06-125, and 06-507) as long as these E.E.O.C. Lawsuit Amendments are filed under the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit Case (1:02-CV-2197) including the fact that Judges Oakley and Baird are not eligible for "Judicial Immunity" because Judges Oakley and Baird acted "In Clear Absence of all Jurisdiction" where Judges Oakley and Baird acted outside of the Georgia's Performance Management Process by not requiring a P.M.P. during these proceedings as an act that was outside of the Georgia State Law of Undisclosed Dual Agency and the Federal Retaliation and Discrimination Laws of the E.E.O.C. and the United States Constitution under Titles I, V, and VII (Read Pages x through xiv) (28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).

Addressed To: The Honorable JOHN GROVER ROBERTS
Addressed To: The Honorable CLARENCE THOMAS
Addressed To: The Honorable RUTH BADER GINSBURG
Addressed To: The Honorable SAMUEL A. ALITO
Addressed To: The Honorable SAM BODMAN
Addressed To: The Honorable STEPHEN J. BREYER
Addressed To: The Honorable ANTHONY M. KENNEDY
Addressed To: The Honorable JOHN PAUL STEVENS
Addressed To: The Honorable DAVID HACKETT SOUTER

Office of the Clerk, William K. Suter, Clerk of the Court
1 First Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20548

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Question Presented..... i
Table of Contents..... ii
Certificate of Interested Persons And
Corporate Disclosure Statement....viii, iv, v, vi, and vii

Reason for Granting this Writ is because it was the Petitioner that **created and filed** his **OWN LAWSUIT** in Federal Court **on August 08, 2002** before the Attorney Charles D. Best was hired into this case on **September 09, 2002** where **"the doctrine of res judicata" CANNOT and does not** apply or exist in any of the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. Lawsuit Amendments **(05-833, 05-1644, 06-125, and 06-507) as long as these Lawsuit Amendments are filed under the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit Case (1;02-CV-2197) as only (1) One E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Lawsuit (1;02-CV-2197)** where the Petitioner has **RESCINDED** the February 12, 2003 Dismissal of the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit **(1;02-CV-2197)** that does not **BEAR** the Petitioner's Signature for Dismissal as being **"the Only Party of Consent"** as the Lawsuit's Creator and Originator that makes the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Lawsuit **(1;02-CV-2197) a valid and enforceable lawsuit**.....viii, ix, x, xi, xii, xiii, and xiv

(Please Read Pgs. x through xiv)

Table of Authorities.....xv, xvi, xvii, and xviii
Table of Appendices Exhibits.....xviii, xix, xx, and xxi

Title page..... 1
Statement of Jurisdiction..... 2

Statement of the Case..... 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9
Conclusion.....9 and10

CERTIFICATE OF INTERESTED PERSONS AND CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Sgt. Emmett L. Williams –vs.- State of Georgia "et al." Case No, 05-15760-CC (05-1644), and three other **Incorporated or Amended** Conspiracy Cases known as: Appeal Cases 1:05-CV-1303 (05-1644), 1:04-CV-2415 (05-833), 1:05-CV-1781 (06-125), and 1:05-CV-2274 (06-507)

The undersigned Petitioner, Sgt. Emmett L. Williams, hereby certifies that the following is a complete list of person and entities that who have an interest in the outcome of this case:

(a) Sgt. Emmett L. Williams, Petitioner
(b) The State of Georgia DOD National Guard Headquarters under;
(c) Maj. Gen. David Poythress, Commander, as a related Respondent and not eligible for "res Judicata" and **BARRED** by State, Federal, and Constitutional Law after the Petitioner' August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197) **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**
(d) Thomas H. Blackstock, Facilities Manager, as a related Respondent and not eligible for "res judicata" and **BARRED** by State, Federal, and Constitutional Law after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197) **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

(e) James Bruno, Chief of Staff and Appointing Authority, as a related Respondent and not eligible for "res judicata" and **BARRED** by State, Federal and Constitutional Law after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197) **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

(f) Kenneth R. Weldrep, J.A.G. and Prosecuting Attorney, as a related Respondent and not eligible for "res judicata" or "Judicial Immunity" and **BARRED** by State, Federal, and Constitutional Law after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197) **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

(g) Lois Oakley, State Administrative Hearing Chief Law Judge, as a related Respondent and not eligible for "res judicata" and "Judicial Immunity" and **BARRED** by State, Federal, and Constitutional Law after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197) **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

(h) W. Joseph Baird, state Administrative Hearings Judge, as a related Respondent not eligible for "res judicata" and "Judicial Immunity" and **BARRED** by State, Federal, and Constitutional Law after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197) **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

(i) Ed. Chamberlain, DOD Personnel Administrator, as a related Respondent not eligible for "res judicata" and **BARRED** by State, Federal, and Constitutional Law after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197) **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a))**

(j) Sandra Bruce, DOD Personnel Administrator, as a related Respondent and not eligible for "res judicata" and **BARRED** by State, Federal, and Constitutional Law before and after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197) **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

(k) Raymond Faunt, Security Manager and the Plaintiff's Immediate Supervisor, as a related Respondent and not eligible for "res judicata" and **BARRED** by State, Federal, and Constitutional Law before and after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197) **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

(l) Charles D. Best, illegal and unlawfully Conducted a Undisclosed Dual Agency Relationship as a Georgia Licensed Attorney, as a related Respondent not eligible for "res judicata" and **BARRED** by State, Federal, and Constitutional Law after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197) **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

(m) G. Melton Mobley, the Respondents' Attorney and not eligible for "res judicata" and **BARRED** by State, Federal, and Constitutional Law after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197) **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

(n) Bryan K. Webb, the Respondents' Attorney and not eligible for "res judicata" and **BARRED** by State Federal, and Constitutional Law after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197) **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

(o) Dennis R. Dunn, the Respondents' Attorney and not eligible for "res judicata" and **BARRED** by State, Federal, and Constitutional Law after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197) **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

(p) Thurbert E. Baker, the Respondents' Attorney and not eligible for "res judicata" and **BARRED** by State, Federal, and Constitutional Law after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197) **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a))**

(q) Robert L. Vining, Jr. United States District Judge **CANNOT** Condone, Support, or Cooperate Within the Jim Crow Mechanics of a Constitutional Raping; and **CANNOT** Unconstitutionally or Discriminatorily use "res judicata" and "Judicial Immunity" from the Respondents' Perjured Non-Existence September 10, 2001 Lie and the Respondents' Perjured Non-Existence 180 days Lie as

Reasons, Grounds, or Merits to Dismiss, Cover Up, or Justify the Respondents' Criminal Conduct and Activities of (7) seven counts of Obstructing Federal Justice and (2) two counts of Perjury after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197) **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

(r) Gerrilyn G. Brill, United States Magistrate Judge **CANNOT** Condone, Support, or Cooperate Within the Jim Crow Mechanics of a Constitutional Raping; and **CANNOT** Unconstitutionally or Discriminatorily use "res judicata" and "Judicial Immunity" on top of the Respondents' Perjured Non-Existence September 10, 2001 Lie and the Respondents' Perjured Non- Existence 180 days Lie as Reasons, Grounds, or Merits to Dismiss, Cover Up, or Justify the Respondents' Criminal Conduct and Activities of (7) seven counts of Obstructing Federal Justice and (2) two counts of Perjury after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197) **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

/s/ Emmett L. Williams
Sgt. EMMETT L. WILLIAMS, Petitioner
Pro-Se Litigant

The Reason for Granting This Writ is Because the Petitioner has **RESCINDED** any and all transactions made under a Undisclosed Dual Agency Relationship including the February 12, 2003 Dismissal of the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit that does not **BEAR** the Petitioner's Signature for Dismissal as being "the Only Party of Consent" as the Lawsuit Creator and Originator that makes the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit (1:02-CV-2197) a valid and enforceable lawsuit where these Lawsuit Amendments **(1:04-CV-2415, 1:05-CV-1303, 1:05-CV-1781, and 1:05-CV-2274)** were filed under the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Lawsuit (1:02-CV-2197) **that all came together as apart of only (1) one E.E.O.C. Lawsuit (1:02-CV-2197)** including the fact that Judges Oakley and Baird are not eligible for "Judicial Immunity" Because Judges Oakley and Baird acted **"In Clear Absence of All Jurisdiction"** (28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).

It is unconstitutional and discriminatory for the United States Federal Court **to ALLOW** the Respondents **to actually BENEFIT** from their own illegal, unlawful, unconstitutional, and discriminatory Criminal Conduct and Activities of (7) seven counts of Obstructing Federal Justice and (2) two counts Perjury while violating and breaking State, Federal, and Constitutional Laws after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197) by dismissing this Lawsuit Amendment of this Federal Case (1:02-CV-2197)

and by denying the Petitioner his day in Court **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

"The doctrine of res judicata" **CANNOT** apply or exist as long as these Lawsuit Amendments or Case Files **(1:04-CV-2415, 1:05-CV-1303, 1:05-CV-1781, and 1:05-CV-2274)** are filed under the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Lawsuit (1:02-CV-2197) as apart of only (1) one E.E.O.C. Lawsuit (1:02-CV-2197) **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a).**

The Petitioner is requesting **that the United States Attorneys Office under DAVID NAHNIAS and MELAINE WILLIANS with the United States Solicitor General Office under PAUL CLEMENT** to conduct a Full Scale Investigation of the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit Case (1:02-CV-2197) including all (4) Federally Filed Lawsuit Amendments or Case Files that were filed under this Federal Case (1:02-CV-2197) where these Amendments or Case Files **(05-833, 05-1644, 06-125, and 06-507) in the United States Supreme Court** are filed under the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit (1:02-CV-2197) that were also filed to inform the Federal Court of the Respondents' Criminal Conduct and Activities of **(7)** seven Counts of Obstructing Federal Justice and (2) two counts of Perjury after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing **(1:02-CV-2197)(28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

The Main Purpose For Bring This Lawsuit To The Supreme Court Of The United States:

1. The Respondents **Obstructed Federal Justice** on September 27, 2002 **after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197)** by forming an Undisclosed Dual Agency Relationship with the Attorney Charles D. Best **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

2. The Respondents **Obstructed Federal Justice** on September 27, 2002 **after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197)** by the Respondents purchasing and the Attorney Charles D. Best selling the United States Courthouse Serving Papers and **DEAD DOCKETING** the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit Case (1:02-CV-2197) **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

3. The Respondents **Obstructed Federal Justice** on September 27, 2002 **after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197)** by the Respondents terminating the Petitioner's Employment from the State of Georgia DOD **without a Performance Management Plan (P.M.P.) or any other justifiable Probable Causes** just because the Petitioner filed his E.E.O.C. **August 08, 2002** Lawsuit in Federal Court

and had them served with that lawsuit on **September 27, 2002** by the Attorney Charles D. Best **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

4. The Respondents **Obstructed Federal Justice** during the months of November and December of 2002 **after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197)** by allowing and conducting State Hearing Proceedings without a Performance Management Plan (P.M.P.) or any other justifiable Probable Causes where Judges Oakley and Baird is not eligible for "Judicial Immunity" because Judges Oakley and Baird acted "In Clear Absence of All Jurisdiction" where Judges Oakley and Baird acted outside of Georgia Performance Management Process by allowing these Proceedings to continue without a P.M.P. as an act that was outside of the Georgia State Law of Undisclosed Dual Agency and the Federal Retaliation and Discrimination Laws of the E.E.O.C. and the United States Constitution under Titles I, V, and VII **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a))**

5. The Respondents **Obstructed Federal Justice** and Perjury before, on, and after January 13, 2003 **after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197)** by the Respondents and the Attorney Charles D. Best refusing to disclose

knowledgeable and known facts of Obstructing Federal Justice to the Federal Courts where the Respondents and the Attorney Charles D. Best's acts of silence were an act of Obstructing Federal Justice and Perjury before, on, and after the fact **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a))**.

6. The Respondents **Obstructed Federal Justice** on February 12, 2003 **after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197)** by the Respondents and the Attorney Charles D. Best under a Undisclosed Dual Agency Relationship Dismissed the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit Case (1:02-CV-2197)..... where the Georgia State Law of Undisclosed Dual Agency and the Federal Retaliation and Discrimination Laws of the E.E.O.C. and the United States Constitutional Under Titles I, V, and VII have **RESERVED** all rights of the Petitioner **to RESCIND** any and all transactions made under a Undisclosed Dual Agency Relationship including the February 12, 2003 Dismissal of the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Case (1:02-CV-2197) that does not **BEAR** the Petitioner's Signature as "the Only Party of Consent" as being the Lawsuit's Creator and Originator that makes the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit (1:02-CV-2197) a valid and

enforceable lawsuit where "the doctrine of res judicata" **CANNOT and does not** apply or exist because the Petitioner's Lawsuit Amendments **(05-833, 05-1644, 06-125, and 06-507) in the Supreme Court of the United States** are filed under the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit Case (1:02-CV-2197) as only (1) one E.E.O.C. Lawsuit Case **(1:02-CV-2197) (28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

7. The Respondents and the Respondents' Attorneys **Obstructed Federal Justice** after the Petitioner's August 19, 2004 Amendment Filing of 1:04-CV-2415 and **after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197)** by the Respondents and the Respondents' Attorneys **(Known As: G. Melton Mobley, Bryan K. Webb, Dennis R. Dunn, and Thurbert E. Baker)** creating the Respondents' Perjured Non-Existence September 10, 2001 Lie and the Respondents' Perjured Non-Existence 180 days Lie **where the Magistrate Judge, the District Judge, and the Appeal Judges herein the State of Georgia refused to accepted the Petitioner's Documented proof and evidences that these are Perjured Lies** because the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. 300 days and 90 days statues

started and existed from **October 22, 2001 to August 18, 2002 as a total of 300 days** and **May 15, 2002 to August 13, 2002 as a total of 90 days** where the Petitioner's Lawsuit was filed in Federal Court on **August 08, 2002** that was filed within the legal Filing limits **of the E.E.O.C. 300 days and 90 days statues** that came under the Federal Judiciary Protection Powers of the Federal Courts on and after August 08, 2002 where the Respondents and the Respondents' Attorneys Obstructed Federal Justice and commented an act of Perjury by refusing to disclose knowledgeable and known material facts to the Federal Courts as an act to confuse and deceive the Federal Courts in this case with Perjured Non-Existence Lies **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a))**.

The Petitioner does not believe that a single United States Supreme Court Justice has reviewed this August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit Case (1:02-CV-2197) with it's (4) Lawsuit Amendments because this Federal Case would have been in Federal Court in front of a Federal Jury months ago, and the Petitioner is requesting that all (9) United States Supreme Court Justices review this Federally Filed Lawsuit Case (1:02-CV-2197) with it's (4) Lawsuit Amendments (28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Facts:

a.) The United States Constitution
b.) The Declaration of Independence
c.) The Emancipation Proclamation
d.) The 13th, the 14th, the 15th, and the 19th Amendments to the United States Constitution
e.) The United States Constitutional Civil Rights Acts of 1964, 1981, and 1991 as amended "et."
f.) The Federal Retaliation and Discrimination Laws of the E.E.O.C. and the United States Constitution that under Title I, Title V, and Title VII
g.) The Georgia Commission on Equal Opportunity Letter Dated October 22, 2001 from Mr. Todd S. Garrison that confirms that the starting date of the Petitioner's 300 days filing Statutory Period was October 22, 2001 that is undeniable and undisputed by the Respondents
h.) The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Right to Sue Letter Dated May 15, 2002 that is undeniable and undisputable by the Respondents
i.) The State Bar of Georgia Letter from the Office of the General Counsel that confirms that the Attorney Charles D. Best is a shady and unscrupulous individual at best dated July 20, 2005 where all transactions made by the Attorney Charles D. Best and the Respondents have been **RESCINDED**.

j.) GEORGIA STATE LAW GENERAL DEFINITION OF DUAL AGENCY: A dual agency arrangement is one in which an agent has been empowered to act for more than one party in a particular transaction. Dual Agency is only allowed with the knowledge and consent of all parties involved, and the agreement for such a relationship must be in writing. Without proper disclosure of the dual agency, no commission or fee may be earned by the agent, the agent may be liable to one or more parties for actual and /or punitive damages, and in some circumstance, one or more parties to the transaction may elect to rescind the transaction.

k.) The State of Georgia Performance Management Forms under the year 2000 ending dates that give a clear description as to the Petitioner's Employment History and Job Expectations that is undeniable and undisputable by the Respondents

l.) The Georgia Department of Defense Letter from the State Personnel Office Dated March 12, 2001 by Defendant Sandra Bruce that confirms the Effective Date of May 01, 1998 for the State DOD Personnel Policies and Procedures that is undeniable and undisputable by the Respondents

m.) The Georgia Department of Defense Personnel Policies and Procedures with the Effective Date of May 01, 1998 that is undeniable and undisputable by the Respondents

n.) DCS-OPS-MS (190) Regulated Job Description Dated 29 June 1995 that confirms that the Petitioner has been exercising his Authority since 1995 of authorizing and scheduling Leave for himself and his employees.

o.) A State of Georgia Training Certificate that was issued to the Petitioner and signed by the Governor Zell Miller for the successful completion of this training that makes the Petitioner an authority on this subject that is undeniable and undisputable by the Respondents

p.) The Performance Management Process Training under the Georgia Gain Guidelines of S.M.A.R.T. was never conducted by the Respondents with a P.M.P. as apart of the State DOD Personnel Policies and Procedures when the Respondents terminated the Petitioner's Employment that was in direct violations of the Federal Retaliation and Discrimination Laws of the E.E.O.C. and the United States Constitution that is undeniable and undisputable by the Respondents

q.) The Letter from Kaiser Permanente Dated September 20, 2002 that confirms that the Petitioner was under the Doctor's Care and Treatment awaiting surgery when the

Respondents violated the E.E.O.C. Title I, Title V, and Title VII by Harassing and Terminating the Petitioner's Employment for filing his Lawsuit in Federal Court on August 08, 2002 that is undeniable and undisputable by the Respondent

r.) The Leave Grids signed by Sgt. Williams while under the non-established supervision of Mark Williams that was not in accordance to the State of Georgia DOD Policies, Procedures, Guidelines, and Regulations that confirms that the Petitioner was still authorizing Leave for himself and his employees that is undeniable and undisputable by the Respondents

s.) The Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit (1:02-CV-2197) that was filed within the legal filing limits of the E.E.O.C. 300 days and 90 days statues that came under the Federal Judiciary Protection Powers of the Federal Courts on and after August 08, 2002 that are undeniable and undisputable by the Respondents.

SEPARATE DOCUMENTED FACTS AND EVIDENCES APPENDICES

1. **Exhibit A** - This is the Complaint that the Petitioner placed in the mail to the G.C.E.O. on October 17, 2001, (1., 2., 3., 4., and 5.)

2. **Exhibit B** - This is an Intake Dismissal Form Dated October 22, 2001 from Mr. Todd S. Garrison confirming receipt and transfer, (6. and 7.)

3. **Exhibit C** - Dr. Stephen M. McCollam Surgery Operative Note Dated 10/18/01, (8.), **Exhibit C** - The Doctor's Letter from Kaiser Permanente Dated Sept. 20, 2002, (9.)

4. **Exhibit D** -The E.E.O.C. Right-to-Sue- Letter dated May 15, 2002 to August 13, 2002, (10. 11., and 12.)

5. **Exhibit E** - This is the U.S. Clerk's Stamped Front Page of the lawsuit that was filed by the Petitioner within the legal filing limit of the E.E.O.C. 300 days and 90 days statues dated on August 08, 2002, (13.)

6. **Exhibit F** - This is a unconstitutional Separation Notice that does not possess an established and prerequisite Performance Management Plan (P.M.P.) and does not possess any justifiable Probable Causes for Termination because the Petitioner had the Regulated Authority and Discretion to schedule leave for himself and his employees since year of 1995 (14. and 15.)

7. **Exhibit G** - This is the front page of the DOD Personnel Policies and Procedures with an effective date of May 01, 1998 (16. and 17.)

8. **Exhibit H** - The First two and half (2 ½) pages of the 1995 Regulation known as **DCS-OPS-MS (190)** that was issued by the National Guard Bureau Military Support Office that gave the Petitioner the Authority and Discretion to schedule leave for himself and his employees dated 29 June 1995 (18., 19., 20., and 21.)

THE PETITIONER HAS ALREADY WON FAVORABLE DECISIONS WITH THE STATE BAR OF GEORGIA AND IN THE SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA UNDER THE ATTORNEY CHARLES D. BEST'S UNDISCLOSED DUAL AGENCY RELATIONSHIP

9. **Exhibit I** - This is a letter from the State Bar of Georgia, Office of the General Counsel where the State confirms that Attorney Charles D. Best is shady and unscrupulous Dated July 20, 2005, (22. and 23.)

10. **Exhibit J** - This is a letter from the State Bar of Georgia and the Georgia Supreme Court disbarring the Attorney Charles D. Best dated December 01, 2005, (24. 25., 26., and 27.)

11. **Exhibit K** - This is a Letter from the State Bar of Georgia Client's Security Fund Dated August 03, 2006 **where the trustees voted to pay the Petitioner a total of $1,850.00 from the shady and unscrupulous conduct and activities of the Attorney Charles D. Best undisclosed Dual Agency Relationship,** (28. and 29.)

12. **Exhibit L** - This is another letter from the State Bar of Georgia Client's Security Fund Dated September 06, 2006 where the Client's Security Fund issued the Petitioner an assignment check $1,850.00 from the shady and unscrupulous conduct and activities of the Attorney Charles D. Best undisclosed Dual Agency Relationship (30.)

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

Sgt. Emmett L. Williams
Petitioner, Plaintiff
-Vs.-
State of Georgia, "et al." **05-15760-CC (05-1644)**, and three other **Incorporated or Amended** Conspiracy Cases known as: Appeal Cases: 05-17046-BB (06-507) and 05-15648-JJ (06-125), and 05-11275-AA (05-833)
Respondents, Defendants

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari To the United States Court of Appeal for the Eleventh Circuit and For the Northern District of Georgia

---

The Petitioner, Sgt. Emmett L. Williams, prays that a Writ of Certiorari is issued as to review the Decisions, Orders, and Judgments of the United States District Court for Northern District of Georgia and the United States Court of Appeals For the Eleventh Circuit entered in this proceeding on August 31, 2005, October 05, 2006, January 11, 2006, and March 28, 2006 where all of the Petitioner's Lawsuit Amendments or Case Files (1:04-CV-2415, 1:05-CV-1303, 1:05-CV-1781, and 1:05-CV-2274) were filed under the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Lawsuit (1:02-CV-2197) as only (1) one E.E.O.C. Lawsuit (1:02-CV-2197) where the Petitioner's Petition for Certiorari should be Granted under these conditions described above (28 U.S.C. &2403(a))

Jurisdiction.

The Decisions, Orders, and Judgments of the United States District Court were entered on August 31, 2005 and October 05, 2005 and the United States Court of Appeals was entered on January 11, 2006. The Petition for rehearing and rehearing En Banc were denied on March 28, 2006, and this Petition for Certiorari has been filed within 90 days, **and in accordance with State and Federal Laws** where the Petitioner has **RESCINDED** any and all transactions made under a Undisclosed Dual Agency Relationship including the February 12, 2003 Dismissal of the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit (1:02-CV-2197) **that does not BEAR** the Petitioner's Signature for Dismissal as being **"the Only Party of Consent"** as the Lawsuit's Creator and Originator that makes the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit (1:02-CV-2197) a valid and enforceable lawsuit where **"the doctrine of res judicata"** does not apply or exist. The Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 42 U.S.C. &2000e-5(f) and 28 U.S.C. &1331, &1337, 1343(4), & 28 U.S.C. &2403(a) because the Petitioner is a "person" within the meaning of 42 U.S.C. &2000e(a) and is subject to the jurisdiction of this Federal Court. Jurisdiction is founded upon the Constitution of the United States pursuant to the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VII), as amended by the Act of 1991, 42 U.S.C., &2000e et. seq., to include Titles I and V of the A.D.A. of 1990; and upon the inherent and the traditional powers of this Court to do Justice.

Statement of Case

The Main Purpose For Bring This Lawsuit To The U.S. Supreme Court is because the Petitioner has already **WON** a favorable Decision with the **STATE BAR OF GEORGIA** in this case, and the Petitioner has already WON a favorable Decision with the **STATE SUPREME COURT OF GEORGIA** in this case where the Attorney Charles D. Best was **DISBARRED** for violating his Attorney's Fiduciary Responsibilities to his Client (the Petitioner) in this case because on **September 27, 2002**, the Respondents were served the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit Complaint (1:02-CV-2197) by the Attorney Charles D. Best where on **September 27, 2002**, the Respondents and the Attorney Charles D. Best formed an illegal, unlawful, unconstitutional, and discriminatory Undisclosed Dual Agency Relationship in this case where on **September 27, 2002**, the Respondents and the Attorney Charles D. Best **purchased and sold** the United States Courthouse Served Papers in this case that **DEAD DOCKETED** the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit Case **(1:02-CV-2197)** as the Respondents and the Attorney Charles D. Best reduced the Petitioner's United States American Citizenship down to something less than a **SLAVE** where on **September 27, 2002**, the Respondents proceeded by terminated the Petitioner's Employment from the State of Georgia without a P.M.P. or any other Justifiable Probable Causes

where in accordance to State, Federal, and Constitutional Laws, the Georgia State Law of Undisclosed Dual Agency and Federal Retaliation and Discrimination Laws of the E.E.O.C. and the United States Constitution under Titles, I, V, and VII **have RESERVED** all rights of the Petitioner **to RESCIND** any and all transactions made under **a Undisclosed Dual Agency Relationship** including the February 12, 2003 Dismissal of the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit (1:02-CV-2197) **that does not BEAR the Petitioner's Signature for Dismissal as being "the Only Party of Consent" as the Lawsuit's Creator and Originator** that makes the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit (1:02-CV-2197) a valid and enforceable lawsuit **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a))**.

Now, this is some very important information that the Petitioner would like for the Federal Courts to understand, **that on AUGUST 08, 2002**, it was the Petitioner that **CREATED** and **FILED HIS OWN LAWSUIT** in Federal Court on August 08, 2002 before the Attorney Charles D. Best was hired in this case on **September 09, 2002 where "the doctrine of res judicata" CANNOT and does apply or exist in any of the Petitioner's Lawsuit Amendments (05-833, 05-1644, 06-125, and 06-507)** that are now filed in the United States Supreme Court where these E.E.O.C. Lawsuit Amendments in the United States Supreme Court **were filed under the Petitioner's E.E.O.C.**

August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit Case (1:02-CV-2197) as only (1) one E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Case (1:02-CV-2197) with a total of (4) four Incorporated Lawsuit Amendments **(05-833, 05-1644, 06-125, and 06-507)** where **"the doctrine of res judicata" CANNOT and does not** apply or exist as long as these Lawsuit Amendments **(05-833, 05-1644, 06-125, and 06-507)** are filed under this E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit Case **(1:02-CV-2197)** including the Fact that Judges Oakley and Baird are not eligible for **"Judicial Immunity"** because the evidences and the facts will show beyond any shadows of any doubts that Judges Oakley and Baird acted outside of the Georgia's Performance Management Process by not requiring a P.M.P. during these proceedings as an act that was outside the Georgia State Law of Undisclosed Dual Agency and the Federal Retaliation and Discrimination Laws of the E.E.O.C. and the United States Constitution under Titles I, V, and VII. "Why", the United States Federal Courts have not informed the Respondents and the Respondents' Attorneys **that the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Lawsuit (1:02-CV-2197) with a total of (4) four Lawsuit Amendments (05-833, 05-1644, 06-125, and 06-507) is a valid and enforceable lawsuit Case (1:02-CV-2197) (Please Read x through xiv) (28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

The United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia has already rendered **an order** that will **ALLOW the Petitioner** to **SUE** the Attorney Charles D. Best as the only **BLACK Respondent** in this case **under the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. Amendment 1:05-CV-1303 (05-1644) that is filed in the United States Supreme Court under the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit Case (1:02-CV-2197)** under the charges of violating the Petitioner's United States Guaranteed Constitutional Civil Rights, Liberties, and Freedoms while engaged in a illegal, unlawful, unconstitutional, and discriminatory Undisclosed Dual Agency Relationship with the Respondents, **but at the same time**, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia has **issued another order** as a direct means of protecting all of the **WHITE Respondents** from being prosecuted in this case with a **"false doctrine of res judicata"** and with a **"false doctrine of Judicial Immunity" that CANNOT and do not** apply or exist in the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit Case **(1:02-CV-2197)** with a total of (4) four Amendment Lawsuit Amendments (05-833, 05-1644, 06-125, and 06-507) where the United Stated District Court for the Northern District of Georgia has released all of the **WHITE Respondents from all liabilities in this case** that were involved and named in the Petitioner's Lawsuit Amendments **(1:04-CV-2415 (05-833,**

1:05-CV-1303 (05-1644), 1:05-CV-1781 (06-125), and 1:05-CV-2274(06-507)) that are filed in the United States Supreme Court under the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit Case (1:02-CV-2197) (28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).

Now, this is some very important information that the Petitioner would like for the Federal Courts to understand where the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia will **ALLOW** the Petitioner to **SUE** the Attorney Charles D. Best **as the only Black Respondent in this case** for violating and breaking State, Federal, and Constitutional Laws that violated the Petitioner's United States Guaranteed Constitutional Civil Rights, Liberties, and Freedoms as a Black Disabled United States American Citizen under a Undisclosed Dual-Agency Relationship with the Respondents, **but at the same time**, the Petitioner **WILL NOT** be **ALLOWED** to **SUE** any of the **WHITE Respondents under this same Undisclosed Dual Agency Relationship** where that the Respondents violating and breaking those same State, Federal, and Constitutional Laws, where the Petitioner will continue to make an argument to the United States Federal Court that this process is totally unconstitutionally unfair because if the **WHITE Respondents had not used of STATE and FEDERAL FUNDS** to created a market to **purchase** then the Attorney Charles D. Best **as the**

only BLACK Respondent in this Lawsuit would have not had the United States Courthouse Serving Papers to **sell between September 27, 2002 to December 06, 2002 to the Respondents in the first place under this Undisclosed Dual Agency Relationship**, but if all of the **RESPONDENTS** were **BLACK** then the Petitioner would have gotten full the blessings of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia to **SUE** each and every last (1) one of the **RESPONDENTS under this same Undisclosed Dual Agency Relationship (Please Read x through xiv) (28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

The Petitioner is the only victim here of a **Constitutional Raping** where it is unconstitutional and discriminatory for the United States Federal Courts to **ALLOW** the Respondents **to actually BENEFIT** from their own illegal, unlawful, unconstitutional, and discriminatory Criminal Conduct and Activities of **(7)** seven counts of Obstructing Federal Justice and **(2)** two counts of Perjury while violating and breaking State, Federal, and Constitutional Laws **after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197) where these E.E.O.C. Lawsuit Amendments (05-833, 05-1644, 06-125, and 06-507) are filed in the United States Supreme Court under the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit Case (1:02-CV-2197)** that is only (1) one E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Lawsuit (1:02-CV-2197) **where "the**

doctrine of res judicata" CANNOT and does not apply or exist as long as these Lawsuit Amendments (05-833, 05-1644, 06-125, and 06-507) that are filed in the United States Supreme Court under the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Lawsuit (1:02-CV-2197)

All of the Respondents are BARRED by the Georgia State Law of Undisclosed Dual Agency and the Federal Retaliation and Discrimination Laws of the E.E.O.C. and the United States Constitution under Title I, V, and VII where the Petitioner has filed E.E.O.C. Lawsuit Amendments **(05-833, 05-1644, 06-125,** and 05-507) in the United States Supreme Court under this Federal Case (1:02-CV-2197) **as being (1) E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Case (28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

CONCLUSION

The **starting and ending dates** of the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. 300 days and 90 days statues existed from **October 22, 2001 to August 18, 2002 as a total of 300 days** and from **May 15, 2002 to August 13, 2002 as a total of 90 days** where **the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. Lawsuit was filed in Federal Court by the Petitioner on August 08, 2002** that was filed within the legal filing limits of the E.E.O.C. 300 days and 90 days statues **that came under the Federal Judiciary Protection Powers of the Federal Courts on and**

after August 08, 2002 (28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).

While the Petitioner was under the Doctor's Care and Treatment awaiting Surgery, the Respondents **purchased** and the Attorney Charles D. Best **sold** all of the Petitioner's United States Guaranteed Constitutional Civil Rights, Liberties, and Freedoms as a Black Disabled United States American Citizen as the Respondents and the Attorney Charles D. Best reduced the Petitioner's United States American Citizenship down to something less than a **SLAVE** where the Petitioner is Requesting **that all (9) JUSTICES review this Federal Case and its Amendments filed in the United States Supreme Court** where the Petitioner is requesting that the United States Attorney's Office under **DAVID E. NAHMIAS** and **MALAINE A. WILLIAMS** and the United States Solicitor General Office under **PAUL CLEMENT** Investigate the Respondents' Criminal Conduct and Activities of (7) seven counts of Obstructing Federal Justice and (2) two counts perjury after the Petitioner August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197) as to finding justifiable Probable Cause to prosecute all of the Respondents including the Attorney Charles D. Best in the name of Justice because Justice So Requires. **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a))**.

Respectfully Submits,
/s/ EMMETT L. WILLIAMS
Sgt. Emmett L. Williams,
Pro-Se Litigant

APPENDIX EXHIBITS

PAGES FROM: (1. thru 21.)

EXHIBITS: (A THRU H)

The Georgia State Law of Undisclosed Dual Agency and the Federal Retaliation and Discrimination Laws of the E.E.O.C. and United States Constitution under Titles I, V, and VII have **RESERVED** all rights of the Petitioner **to RESCIND** any and all transaction made under a Undisclosed Dual Agency Relationship including the February 12, 2003 Dismissal of the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit **(1:02-CV-2197) that does not bear the Petitioner's Signature for Dismissal as being "the Only Party of Consent" as the Lawsuit's Creator and Originator** that makes the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit **(1:02-CV-2197) a valid and enforceable lawsuit** where these Lawsuit Amendments or Case Files **(1:04-CV-2415, 1:05-CV-1303, 1:05-CV-1781, and 1:05-CV-2274)** were filed under the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit (1:02-CV-2197) **as only (1) one E.E.O.C. Lawsuit Case (1:02-CV-2197)** that was filed within the legal filing limits of the E.E.O.C. 300 days and 90 days statues that came under the Federal Judiciary Protection Powers of the Federal Courts on and after August 08, 2002 **where "the doctrine of res judicata"** does not apply or exist **as long as these Federally Filed Lawsuit Amendments or Case Files are filed under this Federal Case (1:02-CV-2197)** including the fact that Judges Oakley and Baird are not eligible for **"Judicial Immunity"** because Judges Oakley and Baird acted **"In Clear Absence of All Jurisdiction"** where Judges Oakley and Baird acted outside of Georgia's Performance Management Process by not requiring a P.M.P. during these Proceedings as an act that was outside of **the Georgia State Law of Undisclosed Dual Agency and the Federal Retaliation and Discrimination Laws of the E.E.O.C. and the United States Constitution under Titles I, V, and VII after the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Filing (1:02-CV-2197) (28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

EXHIBIT A – THIS IS THE COMPLAINT THAT THE PETITIONER PLACED IN THE MAIL TO THE G.C.E.O. ON OCTOBER 17, 2001 WHILE STILL EMPLOYED BY THE STATE OF GEORGIA DOD WITH 300 DAYS FILING STATUTORY ENTITLEMENT

GCEO No.: _____
EEOC No.: _____
Fields in this box to be completed Only by GCEO officials

Due to a very serious fall and injury, I have placed this document In the mail on 17 October 2001 and requesting that it be filed immediately upon receipt.

Thanks,
E.L.W.

Employment Discrimination Complaint

Georgia Commission on Equal Opportunity

Please type or print legibly. Please note that attachments will not be accepted as a substitute for completion of this form.

1. Complainant Information

Emmett L. Williams
First Name Middle Initial Last Name

10 Treeview Drive, Unit A
Street Address

Unit A
Apartment, Post Office Box, Route Number, etc.

Lithonia, Georgia 30038
City, State and ZIP code

7/808-0563
Home Telephone Number

4/624-6010
Work Telephone Number

n/a
Cell Telephone Number

2. Respondent Information (Please fill in the contact information for the agency that allegedly discriminated against you.)

The Department of Defense / The DOD Personnel Office
Agency Name

Exhibit A

935 East Confederate Avenue
Agency Street Address

Atlanta, Georgia 30316
Agency Street Address

4/624-6000 or 6044
Agency Phone Number

3. Issues

Please check only those issues that reflect adverse employment action (s) taken against you within the last 180 days. Please include the relevant date(s) upon which you first became aware the action(s) had been taken in the space marked "Date of Action(s)." Please use month/date /year format for all dates.

( ) Discharge ( ) Laid Off ( ) Forced Resignation/Retirement

Your job title at the time of the action(s): Senior Officer
Facility Police Sergeant DOD

Date of action(s)

( ) Demotion) Involuntary Transfer, Date of Action(s)_____.

Position/Job title from which you were demoted/transferred:_____.

Position/ Job title to which you were demoted/transfer:_____.

( ) Failure to Hire ( ) Failure to Promote

For Failure to hire and/or failure to promote give date(s) you became aware that you had not been selected for position.

Date of Notification of Non-Selection:_____.

The job title of the position for which you applied:_____.

Exhibit A

(X) Discipline Action

Type of action (reprimand, suspension, letter of concern, etc.)
Conspiracy to create false charges and documentation that does not comply or conform to any Georgia DOD Regulations
Date of action(s) 21 December 2000, 03 May 2001, 16 July 2001, 24 July 2001, and 07 August 2001

( ) Denied Reasonable Accommodation
For reasonable accommodation of religion or disability, give date that you requested reasonable accommodation and most recent date your request was denied.

Date of request for reasonable accommodation_____.

Most recent date of denial of request for reasonable accommodation._____.

Brief description of reasonable accommodation requested_____

(X) Other action(s) Date of action(s) 11 October 2000, 21 December 2000, 03 May 2001, 24 July 2001, 07 August 2001, and 16 August 2001

Briefly describe action(s). The Georgia State Department of Defense present Administration and Personnel Office are racist and prejudice and directly responsible for creating, manipulating, and controlling a Conspiracy Racial Discrimination Assault of Homosexual Overtones and Harassments between 21 December 2000 to 07 August 2001 that has continued to this present day that includes Slander and Defamation of Character and creating false documentation against me that does not comply or conform to any of State of Georgia DOD Policies, Procedures, Guidelines, and Regulations while trying to create a scenario of a Ungodly Homosexual Confrontation on the Job with a terminated Subordinate as a direct means of trying to justify terminating my employment as a black supervisor with an

Exhibit A

outstanding and impeccable service record, and I am requesting an immediate transfer to the Federal E.E.O.C. upon receipt of this document.

4. Bases

For the following section, check only those categories that you believe contributed to the actions taken against you. Specify your basis (i.e. Race: Black, Hispanic, Asian, Color: light, medium, dark: Age: give date of birth month/date/year; Sex: Female, male; Disability; type of physical and/or psychiatric impairment; etc.) for each applicable category, where appropriate.

(XX) Race Black_____.

( ) Religion_____.

( ) Color_____.

( ) Sex Male_____.

( ) Age (40+)_____.

( ) Disability_____.

( ) National Origin_____.

(XX) Unlawful Retaliation that bogus Counseling Statement

VERIFICATION

I swear or affirm that the information provided in this complaint is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and brief. I further swear and affirm under penalty of law, that the information contained herein does not constitute a frivolous or unwarranted complaint of unlawful discrimination as described within the Fair Employment Practices Act of 1978 (0.C.G.A. &45-19-44 (6) and &45-19-45(5)).

/s/ Sgt. Emmett L. Williams_____.
Complainant's Signature

03 Oct 01_____.
Date

To be completed by Notary Public:

Exhibit A

COUNTY OF DEKALB .
STATE OF GEORGIA

Personally appeared before me, the undersigned officer duly authorized by law to administer oaths, Emmett L. Williams, who, after first being duly sworn, deposes and says that s/he is fully competent to verify and testify as to the matter referred to and inquired about herein and that s/he does hereby verify the foregoing information.

Sworn to and subscribed
Before me this 3rd day of
October , 2001.

/s/ Ursula S. Rogers .
Notary Public
(SEAL) Notary Public, Dekalb County Georgia
My Commission expires September 15, 2005

EXHIBIT B – THE PETITIONER'S E.E.O.C. 300 DAYS FILING STATUTORY PERIOD STARTING DATE OF OCTOBER 22, 2001 CONFIRMED BY MR. TODD S. GARRISON DATED OCTOBER 22, 2001

Georgia Commission on Equal Opportunity
INTAKE DISMISSAL FORM

TO:	**FROM:**
Emmett L. Williams 10 Treeview Drive, Unit A Lithonia, Georgia 30038	Georgia Commission on Equal Opportunity 710 International Tower – Peachtree Center 229 Peachtree Street, N.E. Atlanta, Georgia 30303 (404) 656-1736

YOUR COMPLAINT IS DISMISSED FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON:

( ) The facts you allege fail to state a claim under any of the statues enforced by Commission.

( ) Your complaint was not timely filed with the Commission, i.e., you waited more than 180 days after the alleged date(s) of the discrimination to file. Because it was filed outside the time limit prescribed by Georgia law, the Commission cannot investigate your allegation. However, your complaint is being forwarded to the U.S. EEOC who may have jurisdiction over this matter. You may contact EEOC at (404) 562-6800.

( ) You failed to provide requested information , failed or refused to appear or to be available for necessary interviews/conferences; or otherwise refused to cooperate to the extent that the Commission has been unable to resolve your complaint. You have had more than 10 days in which to respond to our final written request.

( ) There has been no response from you regarding your earlier contact with this office. However, if you still wish to file a complaint of discrimination, please contact this office at your earliest possible convenience. Please be advised that Georgia law requires all such complaint to be filed within 180 days from the most recent act of discrimination.

Exhibit B

( ) The named employer is not an agency of the State of Georgia, and as such is not subject to any of the statues enforced by the Commission. However, your complaint is being forwarded to the U.S. EEOC who may have jurisdiction over this matter.

( ) Based upon the review of your submitted documents, the Commission is unable to conclude that the information obtained establishes violations of the statues. This does not certify that the Respondents is in compliance with the statues. No finding is made as any other issues that might be construed as having been raised by this inquiry.

(X) Other (briefly state) Per Your request, your complaint has been forwarded to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). You may contact EEOC at (404) 562-6800. Please use your EEOC charge number 11BA20017 when referencing your case.

This determination by the Georgia Commission on Equal Opportunity (GCEO) represents the end of the processing of your complaint under the Georgia Fair Employment Practices Act of 1978, as amended (FEPA). If your complaint was dismissed because of your non-response or failure to cooperate, and you still wish to file a complaint of discrimination, please contact this office at your earliest possible convenience. Please be advised that Georgia law requires all such charges to be filed within 180 days from the most recent act of discrimination.

On behalf of the Commission,

/s/ 10 / 22 / 01
Date

/s/ Todd S. Garrison
Todd S. Garrison, Intake Coordinator

EXHIBIT C – THIS IS WHERE THE PETITIONER HAD HIS FIRST SURGERY DATED OCTOBER 18, 2001 WHILE STILL EMPLOYED BY THE STATE OF GEORGIA DOD WITH 300 DAYS FILING STATUTORY ENTITLEMENT

10 /18/ 2001 STEPHEN M. MCCOLLAM
OPERATIVE NOTE

WILLIAMS, EMMETT

SURGERY: Emmett was taken to surgery on 10 /18/ 01 where open exploration of his elbow revealed a radial head fracture. It was comminuted involving the anterior 55% of the radial head with the forearm in neutral rotation. This was unfixable. This was debrided and the remaining 45% was left behind. The patient has also experienced a coranoid avulsion fracture which was fixed through a separate incision. Thirdly, the patient underwent a ligament repair of the posterolateral quadrant of the elbow as the ligament had been stripped off the posterior aspect of the lateral column. These were fixed with 5 mini mitec suture anchors as well as fixing the lateral ulnar collateral ligament origin which had been avulsed off of the lateral epicondyle. This was a very complex injury requiring the use of Amenda Scherger as my first assistant.

Stephen M. McCollam, M.D.

EXHIBIT C – THE DOCTOR'S LETTER FROM KAISER PERMANENTE DATED SEPTEMBER 20, 2002 WHILE THE PETITIONER WAS STILL EMPLOYED BY THE STATE OF GEORGIA DOD/ ON LEAVE IN ACCORDANCE WITH DCS-OPS-MS (190) 1995 REGULATED JOB DESCRIPTION AND THE PREVAILING 1999 P.M.P. EVALUATION

KAISER PERMANENTE

September 20, 2002

State of Georgia
Department of Defense National
Guard Headquarters
935 East Confederate Avenue
Atlanta, Georgia 30316

Attention: Personnel Office

Re: Williams, Emmett
HR # 0460647

To Whom it May Concern:

Mr. Emmett Williams is being treated for hypertension. He has an on-going problem with his right elbow following a fall. He was status post elbow surgery on 10/18/01, but unfortunately this did not correct the deformity. He has lost function of his elbow and is unable to fire his revolver. I recommend that he stay on light duty until completion of his treatment with his orthopedist. He should be allowed to take time off work because of his disability.
Sincerely

/s/ E.L.W.

/s/ Toan Nguyen
TOAN NGUYEN, MD
Lead Physician HCT A
Department of Internal Medicine
Panola Medical Office
404 365-0966

/s/ GAIL HILL 9/30/02
Notary Public
Dekalb County Georgia
My Commission Expires
Aug. 27, 2005

EXHIBIT D– THIS IS A DISMISSAL AND NOTICE OF RIGHTS RECEIVED IN THE MAIL ON MAY 18, 2002 FROM THE E.E.O.C. TO THE PETITIONER WHILE STILL EMPLOYED BY THE STATE OF GEORGIA DOD WITH 300 DAYS FILING STATUTORY ENTITLEMENT THAT ENDED ON AUGUST 18, 2002

U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

DISMISSAL AND NOTICE OF RIGHTS

To: Emmett L. Williams
10 Treeview Drive, Unit A
Lithonia, GA 30038

From: EEOC, Atlanta District Office
100 Alabama Street, SW, Suite 4R30
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

On behalf of Person(s) aggrieved whose identity is
( ) CONFIDENTIAL (29 CFR &1601.7(a)

Charge Number	EEOC Representative	Telephone Number
11BA200017	Vera J. Sims, Deferral Coordinator	(404) 562-6860

THE EEOC IS CLOSING ITS FILE ON THIS CHARGE FOR THE FOLLOWING REASON:

(X) The facts alleged in the charge fail to state a claim under any of the statutes enforced by the EEOC.

( ) Your allegation did not involve a disability that is cover by the American with Disabilities Act.

( ) The Respondent employs less than the required number of employees or is not otherwise covered by the statues.

( ) We cannot investigate your charge because it was not filed within the time limit required by law.

( ) Have been given 30 days in which to respond, you failed to provide information, fail to appear or be available for interview/conferences, or otherwise failed to cooperate to the extent that it was not possible to resolve your charge.

EXHIBIT D

( ) While reasonable efforts were made to locate you, We were not able to do so.

( ) You had 30 days to accept a reasonable settlement offer that afford full relief for the harm you alleged

( ) The EEOC issues the following determination. Based Upon its investigation, the EEOC is unable to conclude that the information obtained establishes violations of the statutes. This does not certify that the respondent is in compliance with the statutes. No finding is made as to any other issues that might be construed as having been raised by this charge.

( ) The EEOC has adopted the findings of the state or local fair employment practices agency that investigated this charge.

( ) Other (briefly state) _____

-NOTICE OF SUIT RIGHTS-
(See the additional information attached to this form.)

Title VII, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and /or the Age Discrimination in Employment Act: This will be the only notice dismissal and of your right to sue that we will send you You may file a lawsuit against the respondent(s) under federal law based on charge in federal or state court. Your lawsuit **must be filed <u>WITHIN 90 DAYS</u> from your receipt of this Notice**. otherwise, your right to sue based on this charge will be lost. (The time limit for filing suit based on a state claim may be different.)

Equal Pay Act (EPA): EPA suits must be filed in federal or state court within 2 years (3 years for willful violations) of the alleged underpayment. This means that **backpay due for any violations that occurred <u>more than 2 years (3 years)</u> before you file suit may be collectible.**

EXHIBIT D

On Behalf of the Commission

/s/ Bernice Williams-Kimbrough
BERNICE WILLIAMS-KIMBROUGH

May 15, 2002
(Date Mailed)
(Stamped)

Enclosure(s)

cc: State of Georgia Department of Defense
EEOC Form 161 (10/96)

EXHIBIT E- THE FRONT PAGE CONFIRMED FILING STAMP OF THE LAWSUIT THAT WAS FILED IN FEDERAL COURT WITHIN THE 300 DAYS FILING STATUTORY ENTITLEMENT THAT WAS FILED ON AUGUST 08, 2002 IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LAWS OF THE E.E.O.C.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
ATLANTA DIVISION

FILED IN CLERK'S OFFICE
U.S.D.C
AUG –8 2002
LUTHER D. THOMAS, CLERK
By: /s/ DEPUTY CLERK, Int.
STAMPED

Sgt. EMMETT L. WILLIAMS — CIVIL ACTION

Plaintiff,

V. — **FILE NO.**

THE STATE OF GEORGIA — 1: 02-CV-2197
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
NATIONAL GUARD HEADQUARTERS, and
Cpt. RAYMOND FAUNT, Individually and in
His official and full capacity as The State DOD
Military Support Security Manager and
Plaintiff's Immediate Supervisor over
Civilian Departmental Section of State of
Georgia D.O.D. Facility Police, and
Ms. SANDRA BRUCE, individually and
In her official and full capacity as the State
D.O.D. PERSONNEL OFFICE which she
is the PERSONNEL MANAGER,

Defendant.

COMPLAINT

Come now Sgt. Emmett L. Williams. Plaintiff in this proceeding, and states his Complaint as follow:

EXHIBIT F – WHILE UNDER THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY PROTECTION POWERS OF THE FEDERAL COURTS ON AND AFTER AUGUST 08, 2002, THIS IS SEPARATION NOTICE ON SEPTEMBER 27, 2002 WHERE THE RESPONDENTS' TERMINATED THE PETITIONER' S EMPLOYMENT FOR FILING HIS LAWSUIT IN FEDERAL COURT ON AUGUST 08, 2002 WITHIN THE LEGAL FILING LIMITS OF THE E.E.O.C. 300 DAYS AND 90 DAYS STATUES

STATE OF GEORGIA
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

SEPARATION NOTICE

1. Employee's EMMETT WILLIAMS 2. S.S. No. 256-88-5462

a. State any other name (s) under which employee worked _____

3. Period of Last Employment from Feb. 25, 1987 To Sept. 27, 2002

4. REASON FOR SEPARATION:

a. LACK OF WORK___

b. If for other than lack of work, state fully and clearly the circumstances of the separation_____

_____

Termination – Violation of agency rules

_____

5. Employee received: __Wages in Lieu of Notice __Separation Pay __ Vacation Pay

In the amount of $_____for period from _____ To _____

6. Did this employee earn at least $2,240.00 in your employ?

Yes__ No__ if NO, how much? $_____

Employer's name State of Georgia Department of Defense / Ga. D.O.L. Account Number 110081-07

C/O R.E. Harrington
Address P.O. Box 724086 / (Number shown on Employer's Quarterly Tax and Wage Report Form DOL-4)

Exhibit F

City Atlanta State GA 31139-1086/ I CERTIFY that the above worker has been separated from work and the information furnished hereto is true and correct. This report has been handed to or mailed the worker.

REH's
Telephone No. 7/379-9560
7/396-9027-Fax / MARILYN RUSS
Signature of official. Employee of the Employer or authorized agent for the Employer

NOTICE TO EMPLOYER
At the time of separation, you are required by the Employment Security Law, OCGA Section 34-8-190(c), to provide the employee with this document, properly executed, giving the reasons for separation. If you / subsequently receive a request/ for the same information on a DOL-403FF, you may attach a copy of this form (DOL-800) as part of your response.

PERSONNEL TECHNICIAN
Title of Person Signing

/ October 1, 2002
Date Completed and Released to Employee

NOTICE TO EMPLOYEE

OCGA SECTION 34-8-190 (c) OF THE EMPLOYMENT SECURITY LAW REQUIRES THAT YOU TAKE THIS NOTICE TO THE GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF LABOR FIELD SERVICES OFFICE IF YOU FILE A CLAIM FOR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS.

(The Petitioner Footnotes Comments and Argument When the Respondents terminated the Petitioner's Employment from the State of Georgia on September 27, 2002, the Respondents did not know exactly as to what the charge or purpose for termination was going to be at the time of termination on September 27, 2002 because the Petitioner was charged with Unauthorized Leave after this document was completed and turned in to the labor board **where the Respondents created the scenario of unauthorized leave sometime after this document was turned in to the Labor Board** because the charge of unauthorized leave is nowhere on the face charge of this document for termination **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).)**

EXHIBIT G – THE FRONT PAGE OF THE STATE OF GEORGIA DOD PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES WITH AN EFFECTIVE DATE OF MAY 01, 1998 WITH PROVISIONS OF 1A, 1B, AND 1C

GEORGIA DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

PERSONNEL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

SUBJECT: PROGRESSIVE DISCIPLINE **Page 1 of 4**

APPROVED BY: /s/ William P. Bland Jr **EFFECTIVE:** May 1, 1998
WILLIAM P. BLAND, JR.
Major General, GA ANG
The Adjutant General

PURPOSE: To ensure that employees are provided a proper direction in achieving optimum performance, and to promote sound management practices in directing the work of the Georgia Department of Defense and its employees.

POLICY: The Georgia Department of Defense requires that all managers and supervisors take prompt, progressive, and appropriate steps to correct unacceptable job behavior or performance deficits. These measures are intended to inform the employee of behaviors that are unacceptable, and to assist the employee in taking responsibility for prompt corrective action and improved performance.

APPLICATION: All state employees of the Georgia Department of Defense.

PROVISIONS:

1. **ORIENTATION AND COUNSELING.**

   A. At the beginning of the employment period, the supervisor will give the employee a copy of his/her **job description and Performance Management Plan (P.M.P.).**

   B. The supervisor will discuss with the employee the expected work standards and policies that are applicable to the employee's position, and the

interest of the division in the employee's services. The explanation given to the employee by the supervisor should be clear and precise to ensure that employee understands **what is expected.**

C. Although there may be duties required of the employee that are not included in his/her PMP, such necessary and job-related duties may be assigned to the employee, and the employee will be expected to perform them. If such duties are of long duration or become a significant part of the job, it is the supervisor's responsibility to **amend the PMP accordingly**.

EXHIBIT H – THE FIRST TWO AND A HALF (2 1/2) PAGES OF THE OF THE DCS-OPS-MS (190) REGULATED JOB DESCRIPTION DATED 29 JUNE 1995 THAT WAS NEVER AMENDED, CHANGED, DELETED, OR ALTERED THAT AUTHORIZED THE PETITIONER WITH THE AUTHORITY TO SCHEDULE LEAVE FOR HIMSELF AND HIS EMPLOYEES

(JOB DESCRIPTION)

DCS-OPS-MS (190) **29 June 1995**

MEMORANDUM FOR
Sgt. E. L. Williams, Facility Police

SUBJECT: Response to New Schedule Inquiry

1. This memorandum is in response to your memorandum concerning a new duty hour schedule. I have reviewed your memorandum and have discussed this situation extensively with you. The following provides you direct guidance for administering the DOD facility police schedule at the Atlanta DOD Reservation. This schedule will be accomplished using scheduled duty shifts not to exceed 12 hours. The Facility Police Sergeant is responsible to schedule duty shifts for his employees. He has total authority to schedule employees to fill the required shifts as specified by the Military Support Office.

2. **GENERAL.**

   a. **Hours required for security: 136 hrs. on a normal week.**

      1. **Total number of permanent employees: 3 (to include 1 Sergeant)**
      2. **Total number of casual employees available for Sat. – Man./ :3.**

Exhibit H

DCS-OPS-MS (190)

b. Other consideration:

1. Reserve Drill one weekend a month for one permanent employee.
2. Time for the Police Sergeant to supervise and not work all shifts.
3. Time for employees to take leave and have at least two days off a week.
4. Keep overtime to an absolute minimum.

3. FACTS.

a. There are 8 – 8hrs shifts required between Tuesday beginning at 1600 and Saturday at 0800. 64 hours total.

b. There are 72 hours required between 0800 on Saturday and 0800 on Tuesdays. This can be accomplished using 8 or 12 hour shifts. Casual employee use should be maximized.

c. A minimum of 16 hours must be worked by casual employees to prevent overtime. The desire is to allow use of the casual employees on weekends to provide the Sergeant supervisory time and to allow flexibility for permanent employee leave and time off. **Example**: If casual employees work 3-12 hour shifts over the weekend, 20 additional hours are free to divide for supervisory time or leave time. If casual employees work 4-12 hour shifts on the weekend, 32 hours are available to divide for leave time and supervisory time.

4. OBSERVATION. During the last two years I have listened to many concerns and problems areas. I have also received various complaints over the way

Exhibit H

DCS-OPS-MS (190)

past operations have been conducted. The following observations and comments are provided:

a. The Sergeant is not allowed supervisory time on the clock. (The Sergeant has to pull shifts.)
b. The Sergeant has to wear his own personal pager.
c. The Sergeant is not given authority to conduct his affairs without interference from the administration.
d. The Sergeant has to be concerned with keeping the budget balanced.
e. The old schedule did not work and it was similar to the one proposed by management.
f. The Sergeant receives no "perks" as a supervisor.

5. OBSERVATION RESPONSE.

a. The Sergeant is provided guidelines for scheduling security shifts. He has the authority and responsibility to ensure that the shifts are adequately covered. This also includes scheduling leave for himself and employees. This also provides authority and options to schedule supervisory time not to exceed 16 hours per week. This does not preclude that situation such as 4 day holiday weekend will need additional staffing. I cannot reiterate enough that casual employees should be maximized in situations where additional staffing is required. Additional staffing is not, as a rule, an opportunity for permanent employees to gain Compensation time. If casual employees are managed with care,

Exhibit H

DCS-OPS-MS (190)

permanent employees can enjoy scheduled leave time without other permanent employees having to always work excessive hours or overtime.

b. The Sergeant is no longer required to rely on his personal pager for facility police business. A state of the art, statewide pager, was provided to the Sergeant recently. The Sergeant has the opportunity to stay in contact with his subordinates and supervisors at any given time provided the calls are returned when paged and the pager is turned on. This should alleviate any communication problem that may occur if the Sergeant leaves the local area. As a Supervisor, the Sergeant must telephonically handle pagers on occasion when not on the clock. The Sergeant must also ensure that his subordinates are properly trained to page him and to handle possible emergency situations.

c. The Sergeant has the authority to handle situations and should do so to the Maximum Extent Practical and within the authority granted to him. The administration has no desire to interfere with the supervisory duties of the Facility Police Sergeant. The Sergeant, as has always been the case, is expected to run the day to day Department Operations. The administration expects compliance with guidelines and parameters for the Department. It is the RESPONSIBILITY of the Sergeant to ensure that administration Policies and Directives are Implemented and Enforced.

APPENDIX EXHIBITS

PAGES FROM: (22. thru 30.)
EXHIBITS: (I THRU L)

On August 08, 2002, it was the Petitioner that **Created and Filed** his **OWN LAWSUIT** in Federal Court on August 08, 2002 before the Attorney Charles D. Best was hired into this case on September 09, 2002 **where "the doctrine of res judicata" CANNOT and does not** apply or exist in any of the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. Lawsuit Amendments **(05-833, 05-1644, 06-125, and 06-507)** as long as these Lawsuit Amendments are filed under the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Federally Filed Lawsuit Case **(1:02-CV-2197)** as only (1) one E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Lawsuit Case **(1:02-CV-2197)** where the Petitioner has **RESCINDED** any and all transactions made under a Undisclosed Dual Agency Relationship including the February 12, 2003 Dismissal of the Petitioner's August 08, 2002 Lawsuit **(1:02-CV-2197)** that does not **BEAR** the Petitioner's Signature for Dismissal as being **"the Only Party of Consent"** as the Lawsuit's Creator and Originator that makes the Petitioner's E.E.O.C. August 08, 2002 Lawsuit **(1:02-CV-2197) a valid and enforceable Lawsuit** including the fact that Judges Oakley and Baird are not eligible for **"Judicial Immunity"** because Judges Oakley and Baird acted **"In Clear Absence of All Jurisdiction"** where Judges Oakley and Baird acted outside of the Georgia's Performance Management Process by not requiring a P.M.P. during these proceedings as an act that was outside of the Georgia State Law of Undisclosed Dual Agency and the Federal Retaliation and Discrimination Laws of the E.E.O.C. and the United States Constitution under Titles I, V, and VII where the Petitioner has already **Won** a favorable Decision with the **State Bar of Georgia** in this case, and the Petitioner has already **Won** a favorable Decision **In the State Supreme Court of Georgia** in this case where the Attorney Charles D. Best was **Disbarred** for violating his Fiduciary Responsibilities to his Client (the Petitioner) in this case **(28 U.S.C. &2403(a)).**

EXHIBIT I – STATE BAR OF GEORGIA LETTER THAT CONFIRMS THAT THE ATTORNEY CHARLES D. BEST IS SHADY AND UNSCRUPULOUS AS UNDISCLOSED DUAL AGENCY DATED JULY 20, 2005

STATE BAR OF GEORGIA

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

WILLAM P. SMITH, III
GENERAL COUNSEL
Bar Counsel
ROBERT E. McCORMACK
Deputy General Counsel
JOHN J. SHIPTENKO
Assistant General Counsel

Disciplinary Counsel
PAULA J. FREDERICK
Deputy General Counsel
JENNY K. MITTELMAN
JONATHAN HEWETT
Sr. Assistant General Counsel
GENE CHAPMAN
ELIZABETH M. WILLIAMSON
KELLYN O. McGEE
Assistant General Counsel
REBECCA A. HALL
Grievance Counsel

July 20, 2005

Sgt. Emmett L. Williams
1266 Bedford Avenue
Columbus, Georgia 31903

Re: In the Matter of Charles Douglas Best
State Disciplinary Board Docket No. 4914

Dear Sgt. Williams:

The Investigative Panel of the State Disciplinary Board has concluded its investigation into the grievance that you filed against Charles Best. Mr. Best never filed any response to your complaint and at its meeting on July 8, 2005, the Panel issued a Notice of Discipline recommending that the Supreme Court disbar him.

The Panel had seven other cases before it regarding Mr Best. Apparently he has abandoned his practice. We have

Exhibit I

received word that he is a resident in a facility for people who suffer from alcoholism or drug abuse, but have not been able to contact him there.

It is likely that the Court will enter an order disbarring Mr. Best if he does not file any response to the Notices of Discipline. I will be in touch with you when the Supreme Court enters an order in this matter; in the meantime, feel free to contact me or Deborah Grant, my assistant, if you have questions.

Sincerely,

/s/ Paula Frederick
Paula J Frederick
Deputy General Counsel

PJF/dmg

104 Marietta Street, N.W.- Suite 100 - Atlanta, Georgia 30303
(404) 527-8720 - (800) 334-6865 - (404) 527-8744 facsimile

EXHIBIT J – STATE BAR OF GEORGIA LETTER THAT CONFIRMS THAT THE ATTORNEY CHARLES D. BEST IS SHADY AND UNSCRUPULOUS AS UNDISCLOSED DUAL AGENCY DATED DECEMBER 01, 2005

STATE BAR OF GEORGIA

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

WILLIAM P. SMITH, III
GENERAL COUNSEL
Bar Counsel
ROBERT E. McCORMACK
Deputy General Counsel
JOHN J. SHIPTENKO
Assistant General Counsel

Disciplinary Counsel
PAULA J. FREDERICK
Deputy General Counsel
JENNY K. MITTELMAN
JONATHAN HEWETT
Sr. Assistant General Counsel
GENE CHAPMAN
KELLYN O. McGEE
REBECCA A. HALL
Assistant General Counsel
CARMEN ROJAS RAFTER
Grievance Counsel

December 1, 2005

Sgt. Emmett L. Williams
1266 Bedford Avenue
Columbus, Georgia 31903

Re: In the Matter of Charles Douglas Best
State Disciplinary Board Docket No. 4914

Dear Sgt. Williams:

On November 21, 2005, the Supreme Court of Georgia entered an Order disbarring Charles Douglas Best from the practice of law in Georgia. I have enclosed a copy of the Order for your records.

I spoke to Mr. Best last month. He is Presently a patient at Bethel Christian Homes, where he is being treated for an undisclosed problem. I have not been able to get information from Mr. Best regarding your case or the whereabouts of your client file.

Exhibit J

With entry of the Court's Order, our investigation of Mr. Best is over. However, you may wish to file a claim with the State Bar of Georgia's Client' Security Fund, which is sometimes able to reimburse money that former clients have lost as the result of a lawyer's dishonest conduct. You may be able to recover some of the fees that you paid Mr. Best by filing an application to the Clients' Security Fund. I have enclosed a brochure that describes the Fund and an application form for your use.

If you have not already done so, you will need to hire another lawyer to complete the legal matter that Mr. Best was handling for you. Good Luck with your case

Sincerely,

/s/ Paula Frederick
Paula J Frederick
Deputy General Counsel

PJF/dmg

104 Marietta Street, N.W.- Suite 100 - Atlanta, Georgia 30303
(404) 527-8720 - (800) 334-6865 - (404) 527-8744 facsimile

Exhibit J

In the Supreme Court of Georgia

Decided: NOV 21 2005
(Stamped)

S05Y1880; S05Y1881, S05Y1882, S05Y1883,
S05Y1884; S05Y1885, S05Y1886, S05Y1887
IN THE MATTER OF CHARLES DOUGLAS BEST

PER CURIAM.

These disciplinary matters are before the Court on the Notices of Discipline filed by the State Bar against Respondent Charles Douglas Best in which it recommends that Best be disbarred for his violations of Rules 1.3; 1.4; 8.4 (a) (4); and 9.3 of the Rules of Professional Conduct found in Bar Rule 4-102 (d). The State Bar Served Best by publication in accordance with Bar Rule 4-203.1 (b) (3) (ii) but Best failed to reject the notice within 30 days of service, see Bar Rule 4-208.3 (a), and accordingly, he in default, has no right to an evidentiary hearing and is subject to the discipline of this Court. See Bar Rule 4-208 1(b)

Footnote:

We note that, for the first time, Best has filed a petition for voluntary surrender of his license with this Court. In general, However, such petitions may be submitted prior to the issuance of a formal complaint for the consideration by the State Bar, not this Court. See Bar Rule 4-227 (b).

Exhibit J

In each of the eight cases, Best accepted representation and fees, but took little or no action to pursue his clients' cases. His telephone numbers were disconnected and he moved from his office with no forwarding address. He did not contact or communicate with his clients, nor did he take any action to protect their rights. Accordingly, we agree with the name of Charles Douglas Best be removed from rolls of attorneys authorized to practice law in the State of Georgia. He is reminded of his duties under Bar Rule 4-219 (c).

Disbarred. All the Justices concur.

Footnote:

Therefore, we do not consider Best's untimely petition, and it does not change the outcome in this case.

EXHIBIT K – THIS IS A LETTER FROM THE STATE BAR OF GEORGIA DATED AUGUST 03, 2006 WHERE THE TRUSTEES OF THE CLIENTS' SECUIRTY FUND MET AND AGREED TO REINBURSE THE PETITIONER A TOTAL OF $1,850.00 FROM THE ATTORNEY CHARLES D. BEST'S AND THE RESPONDENTS' UNDISCLOSED DUAL AGENCY RELATIONSHIP

STATE BAR OF GEORGIA
Clients' Security Fund

August 3, 2006

Mr. Emmett L. Williams
1266 Bedford Avenue
Columbus, Georgia 31903

Re: Your Application for Relief to the Clients' Security Fund

Dear Mr. Williams:

On July 27, 2006, the trustees of the Clients' Security Fund of the State Bar of Georgia met and reviewed the application for relief you filed against Charles Douglas Best I am pleased to report that after careful consideration the trustees voted to pay your claim in the amount of $1,850.00.

As required by the rules governing the Clients' Security Fund, before we can forward a check to you, you must assign to the Clients' Security Fund your claim against Charles Douglas Best to the extent of 1,850.00. A copy of the rules and assignment are enclosed. Please sign the assignment in the presence of a Notary Public and return the entire executed assignment to my attention at the address shown below.

In addition, the State Bar of Georgia reports all payments from the Clients' Security Fund to the Internal Revenue Service via IRS Form 1099. For this reason, you must complete and sign the enclosed Request for Taxpayer Identification Number form and return it to us along with the executed assignment. At the end of

Exhibit K

this year, you will receive IRS form 1099. You should consult with an accountant or tax professional to determine if this amount should be considered taxable income.

After receiving the executed assignment and tax form, I will promptly forward your check by certified mail. You may also arrange to pick the check up at State Bar Headquarter by calling me at (404) 527-8771.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me at (404) 527-8771.

Sincerely,

/s/ BrossDerrickson
Betty Ross Derrickson
Paralegal

Enclosures

104 Marietta Street – Suite 100 – Atlanta, Georgia 30303
(404) 527-8720 – (800) 334-6865 – (404) 527-8744 facsimile

EXHIBIT L – THIS IS A LETTER FROM THE STATE BAR OF GEORGIA DATED SEPTEMBER 06, 2006 WHERE THE TRUSTEES OF THE CLIENTS' SECURITY FUND MADE A REIMBURSEMENT TO THE PETITIONER FOR A TOTAL OF $1,850.00 FOR THE ATTORNEY CHARLES D. BEST'S AND THE RESPONDENTS' UNDISCLOSED DUAL AGENCY RELATIONSHIP

STATE BAR OF GEORGIA
Clients' Security Fund

September 6, 2006

Certified Mail
Return Receipts Requested

Mr. Emmett L. Williams
1266 Bedford Avenue
Columbus, Georgia 31903

Re: Your Application for Relief to the Clients' Security Fund

Dear Mr. Williams:

This will acknowledge receipt of the executed Assignment and Request for Taxpayer Identification Number form W-9, which appears to be in order Accordingly, please find enclosed a check made payable to you in the amount of 1,850.00 We hope this payment, at least to some extent, help remedy the loss you have suffered.

Sincerely,
/s/ BrossDerrickson
Betty Ross Derrickson
Paralegal

Enclosure

104 Marietta Street - Suite 100 – Atlanta, Georgia 30303
(404) 527-8720 – (800) 334-6865 – (404) 527-8744 facsimile